
UPPER
MILL CREEK AREA
N
NOT TO SCALE
Legend
Major Streams
State Boundary
Study Area
Historical Mill Crk basin
River
US Army Corps
of Engineers
Louisville District
MSD
LOJIC
Shively
Pleasure Ridge Park
Mill Creek
Mill Creek Cut-off
DIXIE HIGHWAY
JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY
OHIO RIVER
264

BASIC FACT SHEET

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Metropolitan Louisville, Mill Creek Basin, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted on May 5, 1987 by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate

LOCATION: The study area is located within the Mill Creek watershed in southwest Jefferson County, Kentucky.

DESCRIPTION: Approximately 3,300 homes and businesses in the study area are subject to flooding from Mill Creek and its tributaries. The Metro Louisville Mill Creek feasibility study will provide detailed evaluation of the flood risks and will assess alternatives to reduce damages – such as detention basins, removal of an abandoned earthen levee, channel modifications, non-structural alternatives, etc.). Such measures, when implemented, are expected to significantly reduce or eliminate damages to flood-prone properties in the Mill Creek basin.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA	Feasibility
Estimated Federal Cost	$ 900,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	900,000
Cash	655,754
Other (In-Kind Studies)	244,246
Total Estimated Cost	$ 1,800,000
Allocation thru 2004	$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	52,700
Allocation for FY 2006	128,000
Allocation for FY 2007	350,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2007	369,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	not determined
Benefit to Cost Ratio at 7%	not determined
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio at 7%	not determined

FY 2007 ACTIVITIES: Complete evaluation of existing conditions (flooding and expected damages), and begin identification of alternative measures to reduce damages.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR FEASIBILITY PHASE: June 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed in August 2005. The Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District is the local sponsor (50% cost share on the study).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Yarmuth (KY-3)

Date: April 2007

Plan Formulation Stages

To categorize and simplify description of work tasks (activities) in this PMP and in Corps' scheduling outputs, the works tasks have been organized into five stages (Stages 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4). These stages are described below:

Stage 0 (Inventory of Existing Conditions) – Sep 05-Aug 07. Existing (Without-Project) conditions will be established to determine the quantity, quality, and the extent of water and other related resource problems and needs in the study area. The existing conditions will also be established with respect to environmental, cultural and historical, and economic resources. Coordination will be initiated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kentucky agencies, and other interested parties. Data gathered will form a current description of existing conditions in the study area and will serve as the baseline for later comparing the Without- and With-Project results.

Stage 1 (Screening of initial alternatives) – Aug 07-Dec 07. Once the existing problems and opportunities are understood, the first iteration of evaluating solutions will begin. Initial screening efforts in the feasibility phase of study will consider the eight alternatives considered in the previous 905b effort, as well as other structural solutions such as channel improvements, levees, etc. Alternate combinations of types of construction, alignments, and levels of protection will be screened to assure that the plan is eventually identified. Each plan feature will be evaluated separately, and various combinations of improvement features will be considered. In addition to structural alternatives, *non-structural* alternatives will be investigated during the feasibility phase including restoration of natural floodplain, ecological values, and watershed storage. (The Corps defines *non-structural* plans generally as those which do not directly affect water-levels in the streams themselves—but which reduce damages in other ways, such as by raising structures, relocations, ring-levees around isolated structures, etc.).

Stage 2 (Plan Optimization) – Jan 08 – Apr 08. Following completion of the initial screening, the field of alternatives will be narrowed and considered in more detail as the study progresses. Alternatives will be evaluated for various levels-of-protection (various flood heights). The alternatives generating the highest net benefits will be retained for Stage 3 evaluation.

Stage 3 (Detailed Evaluation) – Apr 08 – Feb 09. This stage involves the detailed evaluation of those plans which the team (including the sponsor) feels best solves the study area problems. By regulation, this stage must include evaluation of a "National Economic Development" (NED) plan – the alternative which optimizes net benefits. Usually, a secondary or tertiary plan is also evaluated (including a Locally-Preferred Plan) -- comparing trade-offs in certain features, costs, or types of benefits. Stage 3 ends with the distribution of a Draft Interim Feasibility Report and Draft Environmental Assessment.

Stage 4 (Final Coordination) – Feb 09 – Jun 09. This stage includes holding a final public meeting or workshop, collection and response to all public comments on the report, distribution of a final Report, and coordination with Washington-level review groups -- working towards Congressional authorization of the recommended plan.